

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 49829.00008

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 26 were pending. Claims 1 – 24 were rejected. Claims 25 – 26 are being canceled. Claims 1 – 24 remain pending. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Election/Restrictions

The Examiner restricted to the claims to Groups I and II. Applicant confirms the election of Group I consisting of claims 1 – 24 and is therefore canceling claims 25 – 26.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 1 – 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over a Press Release “Hatching Tech Companies” by Maya Alleruzzo (hereinafter referred to as *Alleruzzo*) in view of an article “Bartering for Space” by Matthew Weinstock (hereinafter referred to as *Weinstock*). Applicant traverses.

Claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, whether considered independently or jointly, by at least reciting:

A method, comprising:

- providing space in a property to tenants;
- gathering business information about tenants in the property; and
- introducing tenants to each other based on the gathered business information so that tenants may consummate business relationships.

In contrast, neither of the references teaches “introducing tenants to each other...” Contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, *Alleruzzo* does not teach introducing tenants to each other but instead introducing tenants to services providers, such as the law firm Greenberg Traurig, which is not resident in the same space as the tenants. *Weinstock* makes no mention of introducing tenants to each other and makes no suggestion as to the same. *Weinstock* in fact teaches the opposite, demanding payment (e.g., in stock options) instead of providing additional services to the tenant. As such, the combination of *Alleruzzo* and *Weinstock* cannot yield the claimed invention as *Alleruzzo* is missing a critical limitation and *Weinstock* teaches away from the limitation. Therefore, claim 1 is patentable over the cited art. Further, 2 – 13 are patentable over the cited art at least by virtue of their dependency. Claims 14 – 24 are also patentable over the cited art for reciting similar limitations.

SHANGHAI/750.1

6

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 49829.00008

Claim 4 is also patentable over the cited art by at least reciting:

The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving services from at least one tenant as at least a portion of consideration for providing space to the at least one tenant.

In contrast, as the Examiner states, the cited art "does not explicitly teach receiving services from at least one tenant as at least a portion of consideration for provide space..." The Examiner further states that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that providing or receiving services is of monetary value. However, Applicant submits that it would not be obvious to accept services in lieu of rent as renting space is a capital intensive business (for example, cash is needed for mortgages, insurance, property taxes, etc.). *Wienstock* at most teaches accepting stock options for space, which is capable of becoming money to pay for mortgages, insurance, property taxes, etc. Services for a property owner cannot be converted to money to pay for mortgages, insurance, etc. As such, claim 4 is patentable over the cited art. Further, claim 17 is also patentable for at least the same reason because it recites a similar limitation.

Claim 5 is also patentable over the cited art by at least reciting:

The method of claim 1, further comprising receiving equity from at least one tenant as at least a portion of consideration for providing space to the at least one tenant.

The Examiner states that *Weinstock* teaches receiving equity from a tenant in consideration for providing space. However, *Weinstock* teaches receiving stock options, not equity. Stock options are not equity as equity is actual ownership. Stock options are not ownership in the tenant but only the right to purchase equity at a certain price. As such, claim 5 is patentable over the cited references as is claim 18 for reciting a similar limitation.

Claim 7 is also patentable over the cited references by at least reciting:

The method of claim 1, further comprising providing an intranet portal accessible to tenants for tenants to communicate with each other.

In contrast, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, *Alleruzzo* does not teach an intranet but instead opening an Internet-based incubator. The incubator is used to incubate (grow)

PATENT
Attorney Docket No.: 49829.00008


companies, not to enable tenants of a space to communicate with each other. Further claim 20 is patentable for the same reason because it recites a similar limitation.

In conclusion, Applicant submits that all claims are patentable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance be issued.

If the Examiner has any questions or needs any additional information, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Ah Long Wang

Dated: 2/6/06
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043
Telephone (650) 856-6500
Facsimile (650) 843-8777

By 
Aaron Wininger
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 45,229